

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/803,698	03/18/2004	Michael E. Miller	65937-0047	6051	
10291 RADER, FISH	7590 10/31/2007 MAN & GRAUER PLLC		EXAM	EXAMINER	
39533 WOOD	WARD AVENUE	1	FOREMAN, JO	FOREMAN, JONATHAN M	
SUITE 140 BLOOMFIELI	O HILLS, MI 48304-0610		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•	•	3736		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/31/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

*		. H				
1.		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/803,698	MILLER ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Jonathan ML Foreman	3736			
The MAILING DATE Period for Reply	of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence ac	ddress		
WHICHEVER IS LONGER  - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the may be a specified and a specified a	, FROM THE MAILING DA e under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 illing date of this communication. bove, the maximum statutory period wended period for reply will, by statute, er than three months after the mailing	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be the will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE date of this communication, even if timely file	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) Responsive to comm	nunication(s) filed on 27 No	ovember 2006 and 30 May 2007	_	•		
2a) This action is FINAL		action is non-final.				
3) Since this application						
closed in accordance	e with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims				•		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-29</u> is/are 4a) Of the above clai 5) □ Claim(s) is/ar 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-16 and 2</u> 7) □ Claim(s) is/ar 8) □ Claim(s) are s	m(s) <u>1-8,17-20 and 25-29</u> e allowed. 1 <u>-24</u> is/are rejected. e objected to.	is/are withdrawn from considera	tion.			
Application Papers						
9) The specification is o	bjected to by the Examine	r. ·				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not requ	est that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
		ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob aminer. Note the attached Office	•	-		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9	•				
a) All b) Some *  1. Certified copie 2. Certified copie 3. Copies of the application fro	c) None of: s of the priority documents s of the priority documents certified copies of the prior m the International Bureau	s have been received in Applicat ity documents have been receiv	ion No ed in this National	Stage		
Attachment(s)						
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PT</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent</li> </ol>		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D				
Notice of Dransperson's Patent     Information Disclosure Stateme     Paper No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/803,698 Page 2

Art Unit: 3736

### **DETAILED ACTION**

New grounds of rejection are contained within this Office Action. Accordingly this action has been made Non-Final.

### Election/Restrictions

- 1. Claims 1-8, 17-20 and 25-29 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 5/30/07.
- 2. Applicant's election with traverse of invention II in the reply filed on 5/30/07 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a thorough search of the elected subject matter would encompass a search for the nonelected subject matter and no serious burden would be present. This is not found persuasive because the subject matter of invention I includes limitations not found in invention II such as a biopsy device having a handpiece. Thus, a separate search wound need to be performed.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 5. Claim 21 recites the limitation "the tissue receiving opening" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Application/Control Number: 10/803,698

Art Unit: 3736

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. Claims 9, 10, 12, 14, 15 and 21 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,871,487 to Warner et al.

In regard to claims 9, 10, 12, 14, 15 and 21 - 24, Warner et al. disclose a base (12); a cradle (32) movably mounted to the base; and an indexing guide moveable with the cradle and including a receptacle (36) within which a portion of the medical instrument is received, the indexing guide configured to inhibit rotation and axial movement of the portion of the medical instrument received in the receptacle relative to the indexing guide and the cradle when the medical instrument is locked therein (Col. 4, lines 44 - 46). The indexing guide includes at least one guide lock (38) that is selectively engagable with the portion of the medical instrument received within the receptacle to inhibit rotation and axial movement thereof. The guide lock is moveably secured to the indexing guide. The indexing guide includes a lip adjacent the receptacle (Figure 1). The cradle includes a pivotable clamp (38) selectively engageable with the medical instrument to inhibit rotation and axial movement.

8. Claims 9, 10 - 12, 14 - 16 and 21 - 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent No. 6,451,027 to Cooper et al.

In regard to claims 9, 10 - 12, 14 - 16 and 21 - 24, Cooper et al. disclose a base (18); a cradle (20) movably mounted to the base; and an indexing guide (22) moveable with the cradle and including a receptacle within which a portion of the medical instrument is received, the indexing

Art Unit: 3736

guide configured to inhibit rotation and axial movement of the portion of the medical instrument received in the receptacle relative to the indexing guide and the cradle when the medical instrument is locked therein. The indexing guide includes at least one guide lock that is selectively engagable with the portion of the medical instrument received within the receptacle to inhibit rotation and axial movement thereof. The guide lock is moveably secured to the indexing guide. The indexing guide includes a lip adjacent the receptacle. The cradle includes a pivotable clamp selectively engageable with the medical instrument to inhibit rotation and axial movement (Col. 8, line 43 - Col. 9, line 37). Cooper et al. disclose a deployment mechanism configured to move the cradle relative to the base (Col. 10, lines 10 - 14).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 10. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,871,487 to Warner et al.

In regard to claim 11, Warner et al. disclose the indexing guide including a guide lock, but fails to disclose two guide locks. However, duplicating the components of a prior art device is a design consideration within the skill of the art. *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to duplicate the guide lock as disclosed by Warner et al. to more securely hold the medical instrument in place.

Application/Control Number: 10/803,698

Art Unit: 3736

11. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,871,487 to Warner et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,166,114 to Moctezuma De La Barrera et al.

In regard to claim 13, Warner et al. disclose a guide lock that engages a portion of a medical instrument to inhibit rotation and axial movement, but fail to disclose the medical instrument including at least one notch and the guide lock being configured to be received in the notch to prevent movement of the medical instrument. Moctezuma De La Barrera et al. teach a guide lock (122) that engages a portion of a medical instrument to inhibit rotation and axial movement, wherein the medical instrument including at least one notch and the guide lock being configured to be received in the notch (Col. 6, lines 40 - 51). The claim would have been obvious because the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Because both Warner et al. and Moctezuma De La Barrera et al. teach means for locking a medical instrument within a receptacle, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to substitute one guide lock for the other to achieve the predictable results of holding the medical instrument in a fixed relation to the receptacle.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan ML Foreman whose telephone number is (571)272-4724. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on (571)272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/803,698

Art Unit: 3736

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMLF